Consensus

Volume 14
Issue 1 *Essays: Historical and Theological*

Article 5

5-1-1988

Justification, sanctification and the Eastern Orthodox concept of theosis

Henry Edwards

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus

Recommended Citation
Edwards, Henry (1988) "Justification, sanctification and the Eastern Orthodox concept of theosis," *Consensus*: Vol. 14 : Iss. 1 , Article 5.
Available at: http://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus/vol14/iss1/5

This Articles is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Consensus by an authorized editor of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

Justification, Sanctification and the Eastern Orthodox Concept of *Theosis*

Henry Edwards
Ph.D. Candidate
University of St. Michael's College, Toronto

This paper deals with the Eastern Orthodox concept of *theosis*, a concept which corresponds most closely, although not exactly, to the Lutheran idea of sanctification. The paper deals with *theosis* in terms of sanctification and justification, but because the correspondence is not exact, the paper cannot exhaust the fullness of the Eastern concept. There is a monastic context sometimes appropriate to *theosis*[1] which simply has no counterpart in Lutheran teaching apart from the piety in both traditions. There is also an oriental worldview, the fusion of the self with something outside through transcendence, which appears in the Eastern church, and in various oriental, non-Christian religions; that worldview is alluded to in this paper, but an exhaustive examination is not being offered here.[2]

While the original audience for this paper was composed primarily of aspiring Ukrainian Roman Catholic clerics, the concern with *theosis* is not limited to that part of the Roman church which uses the Eastern liturgy. *Theosis*, sometimes referred to as "deification" or "divinization," is a concept common to the Orthodox church. Certainly *theosis* is a term with which Lutherans in dialogue with the Orthodox church must be conversant.

Dialogue with the Eastern Orthodox church is essential for a number of reasons. Obviously, it is essential because we share the same Lord and Saviour. It is also essential because Eastern theology acts like a prism which allows Lutherans to see their own theology in a different manner, a manner which can aid in comparing Lutheran theology with other western doctrinal positions. Moreover, dialogue is essential because it acts somewhat as a theological conscience for the churches

involved. For example, Lutherans may talk with a certain pride about justification and among themselves know perfectly well what they mean, but when they use the same words with other Christians who understand those words differently the result is at best a confused message; dialogue requires its participants to re-examine their doctrinal stances in order to convey their respective messages in different words and yet retain the truth of the original statement.[3]

While dialogue with the Eastern Orthodox church is essential, it is not always easy. Melanchthon's original approach in 1530 received no immediate response. Near the end of Luther's life, however, an active interchange with the Eastern church developed[4] which led to Melanchthon's 1559 Greek translation of the *Augsburg Confession*, a translation which expanded on and clarified Lutheran doctrine in line with the *Apology to the Augsburg Confession*.[5] Jacob Andreae's approach a few years later met with a response which among fiction writers would be referred to as a "ringer"; that is to say, Andreae received a response which was both copious and gracious, but which, in terms of vocabulary and ideas, reflected a great deal of the Council of Trent presented as Eastern Orthodox theology. Eastern Orthodox theology on either side of the Reformation period sounds different.[6] The historical situation involved was complicated, and it must be seen as a gesture of goodwill that any response was received at all.

The history of contact between Lutherans and the Eastern Orthodox church continued through the four centuries between the Reformation and the present with varying degrees of success and goodwill despite some very striking differences.[7] In 1975 the Lutheran, Reformed, and Eastern Orthodox churches entered into a trilateral ecumenical discussion,[8] a format which could have produced some very important results had it been pursued further. In 1981 the Lutheran church and the Eastern Orthodox church resumed dialogue under a bilateral format with an interesting outcome.

The 1981 dialogue produced a statement of high regard for the Nicene Creed and an agreement to meet again in 1983.[9] In 1983 the dialogue met with the intention of issuing another common statement, but it was not possible to do so at that time. Orthodox Metropolitan Emilianos Timiadis referred to the problem with each church's understanding of theological

terms, specifically the meaning of "justification," and said that an Orthodox theologian "thinks this term says more than the Lutheran understanding of it meaning 'not guilty' from original sin."[10] The International Lutheran-Orthodox joint commission met again during the last week of May 1985, this time pursuing the related difficulty of disparate terminology, but apparently bypassing the thorny issue of justification.[11]

It is not surprising that justification proved to be a difficult term to deal with. For many Lutherans, justification is a central word to which almost everything else is subordinated, whispered, as it were, while justification is shouted out loud.[12] At the same time many non-Lutheran Christians do indeed understand Lutherans to be saying nothing more than " 'not guilty' of original sin"[13] when Lutherans shout justification aloud but whisper sanctification ever so softly. When justification and sanctification are properly modulated, not to the denial of justification by faith alone but to the inclusion of the fruits of faith as the Reformation did indeed understand, a coherent message results, a message which can be translated into the Eastern Orthodox terminology of *theosis*.

According to Ukrainian Roman Catholic theologian, Dr. P. T.B. Bilaniuk, "The central and characteristic part and the cornerstone of the Eastern Christian optimism is a very lively awareness of and an intense contemplation of the complex of ideas pertaining to the mystery of *theosis*."[14]

Dr. Bilaniuk defines *theosis* as sanctifying activity on the part of the Trinity whereby human beings are assimilated to, that is, either incorporated into or made like, God the Father, through the mediation of Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Spirit. Three dimensions of *theosis*, "creational," Christological and pneumatic, are distinguished. The creational dimension deals with humanity as dependent on God, as in the image of God, and therefore, as ontologically good. The Christological dimension of *theosis* deals with the relation between the church and Christ's creative and salvific work.[15] The pneumatic dimension presents the Holy Spirit as Christ's co-worker in *theosis*.[16]

Dr. Bilaniuk proposes this definition of *theosis*:

> ... an active participation in the inner life, light, and love of the Triadic God, which increases in intensity as the process of assimilation of the creature to God becomes faster and deeper. In the

> final eschatological fulfillment of the whole extradivine reality. *theosis* reaches its high point. but it is with the created reality from the first moment of its existence... [17]

The late medieval work, *Theoretikon*, captures some of this flavor as it reads:

> What are ascent and deification? For the intellect, they are perfect knowledge of created things, and of Him who is above created things, so far as such knowledge is accessible to human nature. For the will, they are total and continuous striving towards primal goodness. And for the incensive power, they are energetic and effective impulsion towards the object of aspiration, persistent, relentless, and unarrested by any practical difficulties, pressing forward impetuously and undeviatingly.
>
> The soul's impulsion towards beauty should surpass its impulsion towards what is base to the same degree as intelligible beauty surpasses sensible beauty. One should provide the body only with what is needed to keep it functioning properly....
>
> It should be remarked, however, that an unillumined soul, since it has no help from God, can neither be genuinely purified, nor ascend to the divine light. What was said above refers to those who are baptized.[18]

While what is written here seems at first to be a "Jacob's ladder" type of works-theology, it is clear at a more careful look that it is a variation of sanctification. The *Theoretikon* explains:

> Now the purpose of our life is blessedness or, what is the same thing, the kingdom of heaven of God. This is not only to behold the Trinity, supreme in Kingship, but also to receive an influx of the divine and, as it were, to suffer deification; for by this influx what is lacking and imperfect in us is supplied and perfected....[19]

The passage goes on to describe the ever increasing intensity of *theosis*. While some tolerance is required to read the *Theoretikon*, there is much here which is compatible with Lutheran teaching.

Twentieth century Orthodox theologian Vladimir Lossky quite clearly distinguished between *theosis* and redemption when he wrote:

> Redemption has our salvation from sin as an immediate aim, but that salvation will be, in its ultimate realization in the age to come, our union with God, the deification of the created beings whom Christ ransomed....The redeeming work of Christ is an indispensable pre-condition of the deifying work of the Holy Spirit....[20]

There is little doubt here that redemption and *theosis* fit the justification-sanctification framework found in Lutheran doctrine, nor is there any doubt that redemption and justification go together as do *theosis* and sanctification. The only problem here, given a generous interpretation of the words used, is that Lossky's theology is atypical. It is too neat and too well defined. There appears to be a rather broad spectrum of opinion on how to define *theosis* among churches of the Eastern rite which such a concise handling excludes.

However an early medieval work more representative of Eastern doctrine, written by Maximos the Confessor, sounds very Oriental and quite incompatible with the Lutheran Confessions. Maximos wrote:

> He who after the example of God has completed the sixth day with fitting actions and thoughts, and has himself with God's help brought his own actions to a successful conclusion, has in his understanding traversed the condition of all things subject to nature and time and has entered into the mystical contemplation of the aeons and the things inherent in them: his sabbath is his intellect's utter and incomprehensible abandonment of transcendence of created beings. But if he is also found worthy of the eighth day he has risen from the dead—that is, from all that is sequent to God, whether sensible or intelligible, expressible or conceivable. He experiences the blessed life of God, who is the only true life, and himself becomes god by deification.[21]

The Eastern Orthodox church may have no difficulty accommodating such disparate opinions; Lutheran doctrine certainly does. As with the earlier passage from *Theoretikon*, Maximos, too, tempers his doctrine,[22] but even the qualifying passages sound incompatible with the statement just cited. In yet another passage, it is as if "justification" could be substituted for "deification" without excessive violence to Maximos' doctrine:

> The principle of active accomplishment is one thing and that of passive suffering is another. The principle of active accomplishment signifies the natural capacity for actualizing the virtues. The principle of passive suffering signifies experiencing either the grace of what is beyond nature or the occurrence of what is contrary to nature. For just as we do not have a natural capacity for what is above being, so we do not by nature have the capacity for what lacks being. Thus we passively experience deification by grace as something which is above nature, but we do not actively accomplish it; for by nature we do not have the capacity to attain deification. Again, we suffer evil as something contrary to nature which occurs

> in the will; for we do not have a natural capacity for generating evil. Thus while we are in our present state we can actively accomplish the virtues by nature, since we have a natural capacity for accomplishing them. But, when raised to a higher level, we experience deification passively, receiving this experience as a free gift of grace.[23]

There are several points here which are ambiguous from a Lutheran standpoint, primarily because they relate to issues which are important to Lutherans, but not particularly so to Maximos. For example, the statement that we can accomplish virtuous acts by our nature eventually required at least the fourfold distinction by the *Formula of Concord* in order to be even intelligible to Lutherans and that distinction lay half a century into the Reformation. Similarly, the definition of *theosis* as a free gift of grace speaks first of justification to a Lutheran although the definition seems misplaced.

As Christians we share the same reality in Christ, but have different terminology with which to speak of that reality. Failing to recognize that common reality, we may well end up with a doctrine which claims that Christ died for Christians in Canada, or in Syria, or wherever but not elsewhere and so elevate linguistic concerns above the cross.

The definition of *theosis* could be pushed into a dualistic frame with transfiguration approximating gnostic escape, and so criticized in a manner not unknown to Lutherans. Likewise, the whole of Lutheran doctrine could be seen as justification understood forensically, something also not unknown. In either case, it is better not to do so, but rather to seek the comparisons, contrasts, and areas of obscurity which occur in crossing cultural, philosophical and theological lines. There are certainly corresponding concerns in both the Lutheran church and the Eastern church, even if they do not fit a traditional definition of justification as seen from either side. Many points regarding *theosis* compare favorably with Lutheran teaching. Other points may be either unacceptable or acceptable depending on how they are understood.[24]

The Lutheran Confessions help to establish what understanding is unacceptable and what is not, because the sixteenth century reformers had a vision to some degree open to *theosis*. The Lutheran confessional statements about human nature and the Fall found in the *Formula of Concord* contain

the germ from which a Lutheran stance with respect to *theosis* may be developed, although these statements are not sufficient to complete the task. Other parts of the Lutheran Confessions must be considered as well. *Theosis*, with qualification, is compatible with the Lutheran Confessions. In the same way, the movement, mediated through the body of Christ, from today to the day when we shall see face to face, to the day when we shall be not only justified, but fully sanctified, does approximate what the Eastern church refers to as *theosis*. In order to evaluate faithfully that approximation it is necessary to look not only at confessional statements on justification, but at others which have to do with sanctification.

One of the most difficult points for a Lutheran to reconcile with justification is the "inborn and natural capacity of the creature for transfiguration"[25] assumed by *theosis*. Because many contentious and misunderstood words have been spent in the course of four and a half centuries over such a creaturely capacity, it is helpful to establish the position held by the Lutheran Confessions with regard to such an "inborn and natural capacity for transfiguration," or in the language of the confessions, "the abominable and dreadful inherited disease which has corrupted our entire nature."[26]

The debate over human self-transfiguration goes back at least to Augustine and was active during the late Middle Ages. The question entered the Lutheran Confessions under Article II of the *Augsburg Confession*, "Original Sin" and Article XVIII, "Free Will."

Concerning original sin, the *Augsburg Confession* makes a rather mild, somewhat ambiguous statement to the effect that Lutherans hold a doctrine of original sin.[27] Obviously, original sin was not at first considered a contentious issue. Equally obviously, judging from the extended treatment given original sin in the *Apology*, the reformers' thought regarding the controversiality of the subject was wrong. Citing ancient authorities such as Augustine, medieval Roman authors such as Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventure as well as numerous scriptural texts, the *Apology* explains that anyone born according to the flesh cannot have a true fear and trust in God.

A claim about the entire corruption of human nature, such as that earlier quoted from the *Formula*, is missing, however not necessarily because of the *Augsburg Confession*'s irenic

purpose. The controversial issue was more the tension between justification and sanctification, the tension which the Eastern Orthodox felt was not being addressed by Lutherans as late as 1983.

Concerning human free will, the *Augsburg Confession* teaches that a person is free to decide about things which are properly the subject of human reason. Good works in God's sight are not properly subject to human reason. Spiritual righteousness is brought about by the Holy Spirit acting in a person. A proof text from 1 Corinthians is presented as is a supporting quote from St. Augustine.[28] In the *Apology*, Melanchthon maintained the *Augsburg Confession*'s original stance and wrote, "Our opponents accept Article VIII on free will..."[29]

In short, there was agreement on the necessity of God's action through the Holy Spirit in human good works, but the question of an inborn capacity for transfiguration was, strictly speaking, unanswered under the head of free will.

Six years later, in 1536, Luther prepared his *Smalcald Articles* which were subsequently considered confessional by Lutherans. Under Part III, point I, "Sin," Luther presented seven condemnations of scholastic theology with regard to free will. The condemnations are quite abruptly pessimistic when viewed by themselves and apart from their context. When the condemnations are set in a historical context it becomes hard to tell whether Luther is condemning free will as free, or as will, or as distinct. Rather than talk about the will which determines one's actions, one suspects that Luther would have much preferred to talk about the person who acts. Clearly, the Lutheran teaching drawn from the *Smalcald Articles* is that a person is not free before God acts. Justification must precede sanctification.[30]

With the exception of *De servo arbitrio*, Luther's teaching about free will consistently contains a degree of ambiguity which permits a balanced, ecumenically acceptable denial of free will.[31] The ambiguity was duly noted in 1547 by the Council of Trent in its sixth session under the topic of justification at the end of the first chapter where free will and original sin are distinguished from each other.[32] The Roman doctrine of free will is, itself, somewhat ambiguous, especially the opening sentence of chapter six where the statement is cast in a passive

mode.[33] Strangely enough, the Tridentine decree on justification accords well with both the *Augsburg Confession* and with the later *Formula of Concord* with a couple of exceptions such as free will and purgatory. Most of the canons actually make more sense in the context of the antinomian struggle or in an enthusiast context.

Not all Lutherans were willing to accept the *Augsburg Confession*'s statement on free will, nor to live with the ambiguity which resulted from not addressing the question of an inborn capacity for transfiguration directly. By 1555, again replete with historical complications, disagreement about free will reached a climax. The central question was simply whether a person can cooperate with God in order to do good works. Is there an inborn capacity to do good works? Can we by nature actively do virtuous things?

From 1565 to 1573 the Lutheran theologian Martin Chemnitz published his *Examination of the Council of Trent*. A decidedly Manichean interpretation was given to the Tridentine decree of 1547.[34] There was no inborn capacity for transfiguration as far as Chemnitz was concerned.

More important, however, for an ecumenical dialogue with the Eastern church is Chemnitz' complaint about a lack of precision attendant on the Roman use of the word "justification". Just before going on to argue for a forensic definition of justification, Chemnitz wrote:

> For this is by no means the issue, whether the believers, after they have accepted the remission of sins for Christ's sake, should also be renewed in the spirit of their mind; nor is this the question, whether the renewal also belongs to the benefits of Christ; nor is this the controversy, whether there ought to be in man repentance, contrition, a good intention, and whether love ought to be begun and good works ought to follow; for all these things we plainly and clearly confess, teach, and diligently urge in our churches....[35]

In 1577 Chemnitz' co-worker for Lutheran harmony, Jacob Andreae, wrote to Patriarch Jeremiah II in Constantinople and presented what Andreae understood to be the Lutheran position on free will.[36] Jeremiah II responded by drawing Andreae's attention to the first chapter of Genesis and to an assortment of proof texts which point to cooperation between God and the Christian.[37] However, at the same time, Jeremiah II wrote, "We need but one thing, that is, the help from God so that

we may achieve the good and be saved. Without this we can accomplish nothing."[38] The Eastern and Lutheran understandings were to some extent compatible, but they did not correspond directly.

In the late 1570s Andreae, Chemnitz and several other men attempted successfully to end this and a number of other controversies present among Lutheran theologians. With regard to free will, and consequently with regard to any inborn capacity to do good in the eyes of God, they wrote:

> The will of man may be discussed in four different states: (1) before the Fall, (2) after the Fall, (3) after regeneration, (4) after the resurrection of the flesh. In this controversy the primary question revolves exclusively about man's will and ability in the second state. The question is, What powers does man possess in spiritual matters after the fall of our first parents and before his regeneration? Can man by his own powers, before he is reborn through the Holy Spirit, dispose and prepare himself for the grace of God? Can he or can he not accept the grace of God offered in the Word and the holy sacraments?[39]

This statement coupled with the one on original sin cited before clearly indicate that the *Formula of Concord* rejected an inborn tendency to transfiguration after the Fall but before baptism. However, although there is no question of an inborn tendency to transfiguration prior to baptism, there is most certainly a regenerated tendency to transfiguration after baptism. Thus the important question for a Lutheran becomes one of justification being included in *theosis*. When does *theosis* begin? Does baptism indeed mark the beginning of *theosis*? Orthodox theologians appear to have a mixed opinion.[40]

While the question of the relation between *theosis* and justification must remain open at this time, there is no doubt that the Lutheran Confessions present a doctrine of sanctification which is compatible with *theosis*.

Luther's *Small Catechism* presents a close parallel to the Eastern progression of light, life and love under the Third Article of the Apostle's Creed where Luther wrote, "But the Holy Spirit has called me through the Gospel, enlightened me with his gifts, and sanctified and preserved me in true faith, just as he calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies the whole Christian church on earth and preserves it in union with Jesus Christ in the one true faith."[41]

Expanding on this in the *Large Catechism*, Luther wrote:

> ... the Holy spirit carries on his work unceasingly until the last day. For this purpose he has appointed a community on earth, through which he speaks and does all his work. For he has not yet gathered together all his Christian people, nor has he completed the granting of forgiveness. Therefore we believe in him who daily brings us into this community through the Word, and imparts, increases, and strengthens faith through the same Word and the forgiveness of sins. Then when his work has been finished and we abide in it, having died to the world and all evil, he will finally make us perfectly and eternally holy. We now wait in faith for this to be accomplished through the Word.[42]

Luther presents similar material in his *Large Catechism* as he describes the ever increasing intensity with which life is amended following Baptism and alludes to the passage "from this present misery to eternal glory."[43] Luther's doctrine here does not support a momentary enunciation of acquittal as an adequate expression of the whole of Christian life, but rather the ongoing experience of life in "grace, Spirit and power to supress the old man so that the new man may come forth and grow strong."[44]

Article XX on Faith and Good Works in the *Augsburg Confession* reads, "It is also taught among us that good works should and must be done... that we may do God's will and glorify him."[45] The corresponding explanation in the *Apology* adds, "good works must necessarily follow faith. We do not overthrow the law, Paul says (Rom. 3:31), but uphold it; for when we have received the Holy Spirit by faith, the keeping of the law necessarily follows, by which love, patience, chastity, and other fruits of the Spirit gradually increase."[46]

However, the *Apology* maintains an understanding of sin which Lutherans refer to faithfully as *simul iustus et peccator*. Lutherans know perfectly well what they mean by these words and that the terms are balanced by "growth in grace". The situation cannot be other than confusing at first sight to a non-Lutheran.

The *Formula of Concord* begins with Luther's writing, but is largely devoted to a denial of an earlier antinomian understanding of *sola fide* which saw justification as simply forensic and not regenerative, precisely the complaint registered in the 1983 Lutheran/Orthodox dialogue. The *Formula*, in contrast to a simple forensic pronouncement of innocence, holds

to a renewal to be completed in the resurrection[47] which corresponds to the Eastern view of assimilation to God. In addition the *Formula* also mentions "not a few orthodox teachers" who speak of good works in a manner akin to that of the Roman Catholic Church, but who offer a different interpretation of what is said.[48] Presumably, the reference is to the letters which Andreae received from Jeremiah II in 1576 and 1579.[49]

The Lutheran Confessions contain doctrine compatible with the Eastern doctrine of *theosis*, although no single Lutheran term, such as justification, is able to convey the whole of the Eastern teaching. *Theosis* may be a possibility within the Lutheran Confessions, although several qualifications have to be further examined by both sides.

Assimilation to God must be understood, on this side of the grave at least, as mediated through Word and sacrament; in other words, God is not known by contact with his raw essence. It should be pointed out that Lutherans have a great deal of study to do with regard to their own doctrine which has lost much of its Reformation context.

Secondly, human potential for transfiguration must be considered as present after baptism, not before. This point does not appear to pose any great difficulty, but some clarification is necessary. Eastern documents appear simply undecided about the connection between justification and *theosis*. The connection is there, but just where is unclear.

Lutherans must speak in terms of justification and sanctification, not of justification alone. Justification may be rightly considered the distinctive theological feature of the Reformation, but it was not then, nor is it now, adequate to express the whole of Christian life coherently to non-Lutherans. On the other hand, Lutherans have difficulty understanding the comprehensive terminology of the Orthodox church where often everything seems to mean everything else; a bit more formal definition of *theosis* on the part of the Eastern church may be very useful in establishing the degree of doctrinal correspondence between the two churches.

Notes

[1] Cf. Rudolf Otto, *Mysticism East and West: A Comparative Analysis of the Nature of Mysticism*, trans. by Bertha L. Bracey and Richenda C. Payne (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1970).

[2] Frieda Haddad, "Orthodox Spirituality; The Monastic Life," *The Ecumenical Review* 38/1 (January 1986) 66.

[3] David Willis, "Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry, Reception, and the Bilaterals," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 21/1 (Winter 1984) 101. See also, Theodore G. Tappert, *The Book of Concord: the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959) 473–474; paragraph five of the affirmative theses in the Formula's Epitome is a fine example of the kind of misunderstanding of the totality of Lutheran teaching which can result from talk only of justification without a counterbalance such as that found in paragraph eight. There is a temporal structure similar to the idea of limit in Calculus where meaning absolutely demands context.

[4] Ernst Benz, *Wittenberg und Byzanz; Zur Begegnung und Auseinandersetzung der Reformation und der Östlich-Orthodoxen Kirche* (Marburg: Elwert-Grafe und Unzer, 1949) 6ff.

[5] Benz, pp. 120ff. Benz ties forensic justification to the Latin language and points to a broader definition of justification in Greek. There are, however, shadows of the pietist-orthodox debate scattered throughout Benz' work which tend to shift answers away from the current Lutheran/Eastern Orthodox question about justification. A new examination of the Greek translation of the Augsburg Confession aimed directly at the question is in order, especially in light of the Melanchthonian methodology proposed in Benz' item 3, 123–124.

[6] Charles LaFontaine, "Ecumenical Events: 1981 Conference of North American Academy of Ecumenists," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 18/4 (Fall 1981) 714; Meyendorf reflects the traditional Eastern quality with his statement that many modern day Orthodox would rather be in continuity with the Fathers than with other modern Christians.

[7] Augustin Nikitin, "Orthodox-Lutheran Contacts in Russia Since the Reformation," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 23/2 (Spring 1986) 251ff.

[8] "Orthodoxy's Window to the West: a New Center in Geneva," *Lutheran World* 23/3 (1976) 187.

[9] Lutheran Council in the USA [LCUSA] News Bureau, 81–43, 7–8.

[10] LCUSA 83–19, 5. Presumably there is here also an indication of awareness of the simultaneous Lutheran/Roman Catholic dialogue on justification as the issue is quite similar.

[11] LCUSA 85–25, 9.

[12] Robert K. Welsh, "Justification by Faith: The 'Critical Principle' for an Ecumenical Theology," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 23/3 (Summer 1986) 510ff. See also Julia Gattia, "Justification and Sanctification: Classical Concerns and Contemporary Context," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 23/3 (Summer 1986) 515.

[13] LCUSA 83–19, 5.

[14] Petro B.T. Bilaniuk, "The Mystery of Theosis or Divinization," in his *Studies in Eastern Christianity*, Vol. 1 (Toronto: The Ukrainian Free University, 1977) 46.

15 G.E.H. Palmer *et al.*, "Various Texts on Theology, and the Divine Economy, and Virtue and Vice," *The Philokalia: the Complete Text compiled by St. Nikodimos of the Holy Mountain and St. Makarios of Corinth*, Vol. II (London: Faber & Faber, 1981) 173. An interesting convergence of creation, salvation and *theosis* occurs in the writing of Maximos the Confessor who writes, "God made us... so that we might come to be like him through deification by grace. It is through deification that all things are reconstituted and achieve their permanence; and it is for its sake that what is not is brought into being and given existence."

16 Bilaniuk, "The Mystery of Theosis" 46–47.

17 Ibid. 47.

18 Palmer, "Theoretikon," *Philokalia* 38–39.

19 Ibid. 43. This passage would argue for a late, perhaps even post-Reformation date for this Syrian work.

20 Vladimir Lossky, *In the Image and Likeness of God* (Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974) 103-109.

21 Palmer, "Two Hundred Texts on Theology," *Philokalia*, 125.

22 Palmer, "Various Texts on Theology, the Divine Economy, and Virtue and Vice: First Century," *Philokalia* 171–173.

23 Palmer, "Various Texts," *Philokalia* 181.

24 Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600–1700)* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974) 261ff. In this book, which is extremely valuable for its comprehensive list of primary sources, Pelikan discusses the problem of heretical versus non-heretical interpretation of *theosis* which is found in the works of Gregory Palamas, a late-medieval Eastern theologian. The distinction between *ousia* and nature permits a doctrine akin to Chemnitz' doctrine of regeneration. It should be noted that while Pelikan's work is extremely valuable from a bibliographical standpoint, his use of a controversial framework within which to explore various doctrines tends to give a rather skewed picture of Eastern theology.

25 Bilaniuk, "The Mystery of Theosis" 46.

26 Tappert, *Book of Concord* 509–510.

27 Ibid. 29.

28 Ibid. 39–40.

29 Ibid. 224ff.

30 Ibid. 302–303.

31 Harry J. McSorley, *Luther: Right or Wrong? An Ecumenical-Theological Study of Luther's Major Work, The Bondage of the Will* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1969) 353-354.

32 H.J. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent: Original Text with English Translation* (St. Louis, Missouri: B. Herder Book Co., 1950) 321ff. See also pp. 42ff for English translation.

33 Ibid. 311. See p. 32 for English translation.

34 Martin Chemnitz, *Examination of the Council of Trent: Part I* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971) 428ff.

[35] Ibid. 466ff. Chemnitz' main complaint about Trent's doctrine of justification and the accompanying canons is that they permit too broad an interpretation, rather than that they present a doctrine clearly at odds with Lutheran doctrine. Chemnitz refers to Andrada's interpretation as well as to the fact that scholastic opinion can be accommodated by Trent's formulae. In addition, Chemnitz complains that the anathemas are misdirected. From here he goes on to develop his Lutheran definition of justification, but points out that there is more to Lutheran doctrine than only justification. In contrast to Chemnitz' forensic definition of justification, see Alister McGrath, "*Mira et nova diffinitio iustitiae*: Luther and Scholastic Definition of Justification," *Archiv für Reformationgeschichte* 74 (1983) 42–43 and 58. McGrath understands Luther to have disliked the forensic doctrine of justification which Chemnitz held. In an earlier article, " 'The Righteousness of God' From Augustine to Luther," *Studia Theologia* 36 (1982) 76, however, McGrath reports that Luther used a Hebrew definition of justification, something which forms the heart of Chemnitz' argument for forensic justification.

[36] George Mastrantonis, *Augsburg and Constantinople: The Correspondence between the Tubingen Theologians and Patriarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople on the Augsburg Confession* (Brookline, Massachusetts: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1982) 121.

[37] Ibid. 304.

[38] Ibid. 305.

[39] Tappert, *Book of Concord* 469.

[40] John Meyendorff, ed., *Gregory Palamas: the Triads*, trans. by Nicholas Gendle, (New York: Paulist Press, 1983) 83ff. Fourteenth century theologian Gregory Palamas' writings do not deal with the question of justification preceding sanctification when he writes about *theosis*. The division simply was not an issue at that time. The writings are important, however, because they stand in dialectic with the writings of Barlaam. Meyendorff has paralleled the dialectic with that between the realists and the nominalists. Palamas' writings on divine energies are also important because, with the distinction between energy and essence, the parallel between *theosis* and Word and sacrament becomes clear.

See also John Meyendorff, *St. Gregory Palamas and Orthodox Spirituality* ([Crestwood, New York]: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974) 40, 46. Twentieth century theologian Meyendorff, working from a post-Reformation viewpoint, places justification before *theosis* as he interprets Palamas' theology.

See also Georges Barrois, "Palamism Revisited," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 19/4 (1975) 211–231. This article examines interpretations of Palamas on *theosis* which were presented in a 1974 issue of *Istina*. Meyendorff's interpretation is at variance with those presented in *Istina*.

See also Joseph Allen, "An Orthodox Perspective of 'Liberation,' " *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 26/1, 2 (Spring-Summer 1981)

71–80. Allen draws out parallels between Palamite Hesychasm and Oriental meditation. This article leads to an interpretation of *theosis* as apathetic rather than as ethical action. The question hinges on the interpretation of *energeia*, a Greek term which becomes quite ambiguous in English.

See also Soterios Mouselimas, "Saint Gregory Palamas' The Decalogue of the Law According to Christ, That is, The New Covenant," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 25/3 (Fall 1980) 297–305. This is a translation of a primary text. It should be read in dialectic with the article by Joseph Allen.

See also George Every, "The Study of Eastern Orthodoxy: Hesychasm," *Religion* 9 (Spring 1979) 73–91. This article provides background history on the Palamas-Barlaam controversy.

41 Tappert, *Book of Concord* 345.

42 Ibid. 419. Luther deals with much of what the Eastern church refers to as *theosis* under the third article of the creed, a place where the Eastern church would find it appropriate to do so, although not to the exclusion of other loci.

43 Ibid. 444–446.

44 Ibid. 445–446.

45 Ibid. 45.

46 Ibid. 229.

47 Ibid. 563–568.

48 Ibid. 557.

49 Mastrantonis, *Augsburg and Constantinople* 42–46, 183–186.